

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are pending in the application and are rejected. Claims 16 and 26 are objected to.

The drawings were objected to by the Examiner. Applicants submit herewith a corrected Figure 3 incorporating the changes required by the Examiner. Approval by the Examiner of the change to the drawing is respectfully requested. Formal drawings incorporating the changes are also submitted herewith under separate letter to the draftsman; a copy is enclosed for the Examiner.

By this amendment, the specification has been amended to reflect the serial numbers of related cases.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11-13, 16, 18, 20-23, 26, 28, 35, and 38-41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Steinberg et al. (US 6,006,039).

By this amendment, claims 1-41 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 11-13, 16, 18, 20-23, 26, 28, 35, and 38-41 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is believed to be moot.

Claims 2 and 5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Nakajima et al. (EP 0998140 A1).

By this amendment, claims 2 and 5 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Rangarajan et al. (US 6,275,225).

By this amendment, claims 9 and 10 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 14 and 24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Lavelle et al. (US 6,362,851).

By this amendment, claims 14 and 24 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 14 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 15 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Aihara et al. (US 6,223,190).

By this amendment, claims 15 and 25 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 15 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 17 and 27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Anderson (US 6,154,210).

By this amendment, claims 17 and 27 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 17 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 19 and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Pavley et al. (US 6,317,141).

By this amendment, claims 19 and 29 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 19 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 7 and 30-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in view of Ogasawara (US 6,512,919).

By this amendment, claims 7 and 30-34 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 7 and 30-34 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 36 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Steinberg in View of Rangarajan, and further in view of Lavendel et al. (U.S. 2002/0126147 A1).

By this amendment, claims 36 and 37 have been canceled. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 36 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is believed to be moot.

Claims 16 and 26 were objected to because the word "septia" is misspelled.

Claims 16 and 26 have been canceled. Accordingly, the objection to claims 16 and 26 is believed to be moot.

By this amendment, new claims 42-65 have been added which are believed to be patentable over the prior art. In particular, new independent claim 42 is directed to a method for customizing a graphical user interface of a digital camera for a particular user. The method set forth in claim 42 includes providing customization software executed external to the digital camera which provides a simulation of the graphical user interface of the digital camera on a display device separate from the digital camera. In response to input from the particular user, the simulation of the graphical user interface is modified to customize the graphical user interface for the particular user. Firmware is configured to provide the customized graphical user interface, and the configured firmware is stored in the digital camera to thereby customize the graphical user interface of the digital camera.

New independent claim 53 is directed to a method for customizing at least one feature and the graphical user interface of a digital camera for at least one user. The method set forth in claim 53 includes providing customization software executed external to the digital camera which can enable a user to select at least one desired camera feature from a plurality of different selectable camera features. The method further includes

displaying a list of the selectable camera features, and enabling the user to select at least one desired camera feature from the displayed list of camera features. In response to the selection by the user, a simulation of a customized graphical user interface for a customized digital camera is provided, wherein the customized graphical user interface enables the user to activate the at least one user selected camera feature, and the simulation is provided on a display device separate from the digital camera. The firmware is configured to provide the desired camera feature and the customized graphical user interface, and the configured firmware is stored in the digital camera to thereby customize the digital camera.


None of the references cited by the Examiner, either taken singly or in combination, disclose or suggest the features set forth in new claims 42 and 53. Accordingly, new claims 42 and 53 are believed to be patentable over the prior art.

New claims 43-52 depend on claim 42, and new claims 54-65 depend on claim 53. Accordingly, claims 43-52 and 54-65 are also believed to be patentable at least due to their dependency on claims 42 and 53, respectively.

If there are any formal matters remaining after this response, Applicants' attorney would appreciate a telephone call to attend to these matters.

In view of the foregoing, this application is believed to be in condition for allowance, the notice of which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 42,447

Pamela R. Crocker/cjm
Rochester, NY 14650
Telephone: (585) 477-0553
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646